

minority represents the real will of the individual—a will identical with the individual's own will were his reason not distracted.<sup>51</sup>

Similarly, the will of the state manifests the real will of an entire people divested of the contingencies of class and category—a will that attempts to express the real and ultimate will of the entire spiritual community. The minority of men who express this will as leaders of a particular historical community speak for their nation and for their epoch.<sup>52</sup> They are possessed of the "political genius" that commands the assent of the common rational will. They not only resolve the concrete problems of a given time and place, but are also inspired by a view of life that invokes the assent of the masses. This view of life is expressed in an appropriate "political formula," a formula that expresses the "will" of a "political elite."

Fascism advances a normic conception of man.

Man as Fascism conceives him (*"L'uomo del fascismo"*) is an individual who is at once nation and fatherland, the moral law which binds . . . individuals and generations. . . . [to] an objective will that transcends the particular individual and elevates him to conscious membership in a spiritual community. . . . Fascism is a historical conception in which man is not what he is except as a function of the spiritual process in which he participates, in his family and social group, in the nation and history. . . . Hence the great value of tradition in memories, in language, in rules of social life. Outside of history man is nothing. . . . Liberalism negated the state in the interests of the particular individual; Fascism reaffirms the state as the true reality of the individual. And if liberty is to be attributed to real man, and not to that abstraction of individualistic liberalism, Fascism is for liberty. It is for the only liberty that can be a serious thing, the liberty of the state and the individual in the state, since for the Fascist, all is in the state and nothing human or spiritual exists, or much less has value, outside the state. In this sense Fascism is totalitarian, and the Fascist State, the synthesis and unity of all values, interprets, develops, and gives power, to every aspect of the life of the people. . . . Grouped in accordance with their several interests, individuals are classes; they are trade unions according to their several economic activities; but they are first and foremost the state. The state is not therefore a mere aggregate, the sum of individuals composing the majority . . . [but] a people conceived . . . qualitatively, not quantitatively, as the idea which is more powerful because more moral, more coherent, truer, which manifests itself in the people as the consciousness and will of

the minority, if not, indeed, of one. [This] idea tends to realize itself in the consciousness and will of all. . . . The nation as state is an ethical reality.<sup>53</sup>

Fascism by 1932 had thus developed its social and political philosophy, and it was to this social and political philosophy that Fascist legislation and Fascist policy made ultimate recourse. The doctrinal principles of the organismic conception of the nation, class collaboration, the unitary party, and totalitarianism find support in the justificatory arguments marshaled in the social and political philosophy here briefly reviewed.

#### *Final Doctrinal Developments*

- By 1932 Fascism had matured as an ideology. Its social and political philosophy was exemplified, as already indicated, in the work of Gentile, and its nationalist and syndicalist doctrines had been synthesized into a body of thought that displayed the characteristics of a relatively coherent ideological system. Whatever subsequent developments Fascism underwent took place on the doctrinal level—although, as in all politically active ideologies, these doctrinal changes did, at critical junctures, create tensions at the level of social and political philosophy.

The most prominent doctrinal development was that which is now generally identified as Fascist racism. While the doctrine is prominent in its notoriety, very little has appeared in English that provides any information concerning its character and content. Most frequently the doctrine is dismissed as a clumsy imitation of Nazism, which is not only essentially false, but which also obscures its relationship to contemporary forms of racism.

The racism that developed in Fascist Italy was essentially an Italian product. Long before the advent of National Socialist Germany the Fascists had developed a form of racism out of nationalist elements. "Race" had been identified by Italian precursors of Fascism as one of the collectivities with which men identified themselves. Pareto had even used race as an explanatory concept in his account of "residues" in the volume with which Mussolini was acquainted. Alfredo Oriani's book, which

Mussolini had commended as early as 1909, contained a long section on race in which he identified race as the first order of distinction among men.<sup>54</sup>

What is worthy of note is that pre-Fascist discussions of race tended to identify race with people and nation. This was true even of Pareto, who

certainly was aware of the legitimate distinctions between them. It was also true of Roberto Michels, who spoke interchangeably of races, peoples, and nations?<sup>8</sup> Such usage abounds in the literature of the Fascist precursors. The works of Filippo T. Marinetti, the founder of the Futurists, exemplify this point.

At the time when Mussolini opted for intervention and began to collect around a nascent Fascism various interventionist groups, Marinetti, whose Futurists early entered the Fascist ranks, was writing appeals to the "Italian race." Such racial appeals had, in fact, appeared regularly in his exhortations since 1909. As early as April, 1915, Guglielmo Jannelli, one of Marinetti's followers, exhorted Italians to develop their "racial pride."<sup>56</sup> What is important to establish is that this racial pride was understood to signify a new *national consciousness*. The identification between pride of race and the Italian national consciousness was made specific as *coscienza nazionale* and *il prestigio della nostra razza* were used interchangeably. Expressions like "our race," "the Italian race," "Italian blood," and "Italian people" were all used to mean the same thing. Thus Mussolini's statement of April, 1921, which maintained that "Fascism was born. . . out of a profound, perennial need of this our Aryan and Mediterranean race," along with the pronouncement that Fascism hail dedicated itself to making 50 million men a "great family" united in "one single pride of race,"<sup>57</sup> can only be understood to mean that the "Italian people" needed Fascism and that Fascism would instill in Italians a sense of collective identity. In fact, the expression "race" ("razza" or "*stirpe*") appears in Mussolini's writings and speeches at least thirty times between 1922 and 1932 and is always used as a synonym for the "Italian people," or the "Italian nation." It *never* refers to a biological or anthropological entity distinct from the Italian people.

The employment of race as an independent biological variable would violate the logic of nationalist and idealist doctrine. The distinction between a biological and a national "race" is clearly illustrated in the juxtaposition of statements contained in an authoritative Fascist doctrinal statement issued as late as 1936-

**The subject of the state in Fascist doctrine is the people, not insofar as they are a population, that is to say a "multitude" of individuals, but insofar as they constitute a nation, that is, an enduring collectivity animated by its own sense of civilization. In this manner the state in the Fascist and national conception is the race ("*stirpe*") itself... . Thus ... Fascist doctrine of the state rejects the individualistic thesis ... as well as racist infatuations that rest on ethnological and biological considerations.<sup>58</sup>**

It is obvious that for Fascist theorists people, nation, and race denote the same aggregate and can be used interchangeably. A theoretical racism of the variety with which the modern world has become familiar would require that race be employed as an independent determinant in any adequate account of phenomena. For Fascists, on the other hand, the term race performs the same doctrinal and theoretical service as people or nation.

Mussolini's statements concerning race always function in the above indicated manner. Thus, in 1921 when he referred to the racial solidarity to which Fascism aspired, he rendered the expression specific by identifying it with "a union of free spirits in the Italian nation." In 1923 he referred to the "will of the entire Italian people" as an "Italian racial phenomenon."<sup>59</sup> There can be little serious doubt that the racism manifested by Fascism in its formative years was little more than a restatement of its nationalism. The expression "our race" was uniformly understood to designate all Italians, as distinct from Frenchmen or Englishmen, irrespective of anthropometric traits. Thus, in 1923 Mussolini said, ". . . before I love the French, the English, the Hottentots, I love Italians. That is to say I love those of my own race, those that speak my language, that share my customs, that share with me the same history."<sup>60</sup> The qualifications necessary for inclusion in the race were the same as the qualifications necessary for inclusion in the nation or people. Fascist racism was thus innocent of any specifically biological intention. Fascism, like Futurism and nationalism in general, was con-

cerned with the collectivity—the Italian people or the Italian nation—and was understood to have certain moral, cultural, and historic traits. The nation or nationality was the critical doctrinal concept for Fascists. Race was only an alternate expression for people or nation.

During World War II, in a discussion with Bruno Spampinato, Mussolini characterized the racism of Fascism:

I have occupied myself with racism since 1922 but a racism of my own. The health, the conservation of the race, its betterment, the struggle against tuberculosis, [the advocacy] of mass sport, children to camps—that was racism as I understood it. But there was also a moral racism that I advocated, the pride of belonging to this millenarian race born between the snows of the Alps and the fire of Etna. Our racism with respect to the outside world? The elevation of Italian prestige, of the genius of our civilization. . . .<sup>61</sup>

This kind of racism was, of course, compatible with Fascist doctrine. The logical equivalence of race with nation and their identification with the state is explicit in Mussolini's political thought even in 1921. He continued to use race with population as its referent throughout his political career. As late as 1944 he spoke of "the flower of the Italian race," and in one of his last interviews he spoke of the Italians as a race difficult to govern.<sup>62</sup>

Mussolini was equally explicit in his rejection of a racism that made race an independent determinant in theoretical and doctrinal analyses. As early as 1911 he mocked the racial speculations of Arthur de Gobineau, Ludwig Woltmann, Houston Stewart Chamberlain, and Vacher de Lapouge, all of whom we shall see were to figure prominently as precursors of National Socialist "Nordicism." Again in 1912 he repeated his objection to simplistic racial interpretations of history.<sup>63</sup> Later, as head of the Fascist state he repeated the same objections to Emil Ludwig.<sup>64</sup> Then in 1934 he pointed out that science "does not guarantee the 'purity' of anyone's blood" and that the "new 'civilizers' from the North [referring to the National Socialist racists] might well have unrecognized relatives even within the walls of Tel Aviv."<sup>65</sup> Mussolini's statements were sufficiently explicit to render any misunderstanding impossible. As late as 1942, Fascist theorists could write. "Benito Mussolini, a youth but already an acute journalist and student, early perceived the weaknesses of the simplisms [of Gobineau, Lapouge, Woltmann, and so on] and exposed their excesses to corrosive irony."<sup>66</sup>

It was clear that the elements constituting the Fascist doctrine of race were different from the kind of racism that made race an independent determinant in historical analysis and political assessment. Long before the advent of National Socialism in Germany, Fascist academicians had attempted to articulate a general synoptic doctrine that related the state, the nation, and the concept of race in a coherent whole. Fascist doctrine conceived national sentiment as a collective disposition (the result of man's essentially social or associative nature) to place general, collective interests before immediate private interest—a disposition expressed and reinforced against out-groups. Out of this and related sentiments an ethos was articulated that could integrate the various social and productive categories into a viable national unity convinced of its specific historical and cultural destiny. The will of such a community manifested itself in the state. It was into this conceptual scheme that the concept of race was to be accommodated.

The conception of race compatible with this scheme was one that

construed race as a dynamic and historical constant, the ultimate product of geographic and social isolation, of attendant inbreeding, of natural and artificial selection, and of genetic mutation.<sup>67</sup> Those aggregates that anthropologists study as anthropometric races are polar or ideal types, abstractions employed in assessing the end product of a long historical and biological process, involving protracted inbreeding, differential birth rate, selection, and genetic variation. Within such a conception of race formation, any natural community that is endogamous, that practices inbreeding, is a potential race—a race in formation. Its degree of anthropometric uniformity will be a function of the length of its isolation, the intensity of selection it undergoes, the size of the breeding population, and the reproductive rate of its constituent subgroups. But no natural race would, of course, ever display anthropometric uniformity.

The races to which Fascist theoreticians referred were thus “historic” or “natural” races, rather than races factitiously defined in terms of uniform or ideal types. This conception was affirmed in the theoretical proposition “long-established nations

. . . can solidify themselves into races, becoming new races. . . .” In addition, “it is to be understood that the ‘new races’ . . . *are nations solidified into races*, that is to say, politico-cultural entities, solidified through time and intermarriage, into a unity of blood derived from a harmonious and stable fusion of several ‘old races’ . . . ,”<sup>68</sup>

Within the context of this theoretical account the nation was conceived as a “race cradle,” an essentially endogamous breeding circle whose political independence and internal mobility would tend to relate all constituent members to a common gene pool. This pool, given sufficient time, would produce a relatively distinct type, a new race.<sup>69</sup> Fascist racial doctrine thus assimilated the biological concept of race to a national, historical, and political reality in terms of peoples, nations, and states. The more sophisticated Fascist theorists identified the concept race with population, understood in terms of a national gene pool. Rather than the taxonomic or morphological conception of race, Fascist theoreticians advanced a notion of “natio-races,” that is, politically defined breeding circles.

By 1938 Fascist theoreticians had assimilated the concept race into the doctrinal system of Fascism without creating internal tensions. It was in 1938, however, that the *Manifesto of Fascist Racism* was published, and its publication did introduce considerable confusion into Fascist doctrine. The stir caused by its publication constitutes *prima facie* evidence that extraneous forces were generating structural tensions in the

system. The forces, of course, are not difficult to identify: the rise of National Socialist Germany and its *rapprochement* with Fascist Italy. During the first years of the National Socialist regime in Germany, Mussolini remained ambivalent. His first response was to deplore National Socialist excesses. In 1933 he even attempted to disabuse Hitler of his anti-Semitic postures. He advised Hitler that state anti-Semitism was dangerous and that while "every regime has not only the right but the duty to eliminate from posts of command elements in which it does not have complete trust, it is not necessary, in fact it can be disastrous, to make a question of race—Semitism and Aryanism—that which is simply a measure of defense. . . ."<sup>79</sup> His attempt was notably unsuccessful. Nonetheless, during the period from 1932 until 1936 Fascists generally deplored National Socialist racism as aberrant. It was

during this period that Gaetano Mosca's scathing critique of National Socialist racism was published and Giovanni Gentile maintained that the "Italian ideal" could not be a "sordid racism." As late as 1939 Leone Franzini published an urbane but searching criticism of the National Socialist position on race.<sup>71</sup> By 1936, however, Mussolini had become convinced that the race issue might seriously compromise attempts at Italo-German *rapprochement*, and the race question became one of singular tactical importance. Having failed to convince the National Socialists to abandon their racist postures, Mussolini decided to accommodate them by introducing specifically racist legislation—in effect, anti-Semitic legislation—into Italy. He considered it an offering to solidify the Italo-German alliance. "There is no doubt," De Felice has convincingly argued, "that Mussolini's decision to introduce . . . state anti-Semitism into Italy was determined, essentially, by the conviction that it was necessary to eliminate every marked difference in the politics of the two regimes in order to render the Italo-German alliance infrangible."<sup>72</sup>

But it is not our purpose to pursue the character of Fascist anti-Semitic legislation; it is sufficient to indicate that a certain bad conscience seems to have attended its anti-Jewish measures. There is ample evidence that well into 1943 Fascist officials systematically obstructed National Socialist attempts to transport Jews out of Fascist-occupied territory. Mussolini himself deplored the excesses of anti-Semitic propaganda as late as 1941, but he did nothing to stop it out of fear of alienating the National Socialists.<sup>73</sup>

Mussolini's personal relationships with Jews evidenced little systematic bias. His friendship with the Jew Angelica Balabanoff and

Margherita Sarfatti (his first official biographer) was intimate and enduring. There were Jews present at the foundation of the Fascist party in March, 1919, and Jews served in many leading positions in the state. In 1941 Mussolini stated that he “could not forget that four of the seven founders of Italian nationalism were Jews.”<sup>74</sup> He personally interceded in behalf of the French-Jewish philosopher Henri Bergson and “Aryanized” a number of Italian Jews for valor.

Mussolini's anti-Semitism and the singular racism introduced in 1938 were a consequence, then, of tactical, not doctrinal, con-



siderations. The introduction of taxonomic racism into Fascist doctrine, with the official publication of the *Manifesto* in 1938, produced intolerable tensions in the ideological system of Fascism. The *Manifesto* is literally a confusion of two distinct conceptions of race, the static, or taxonomic, race concept employed by the National Socialists and the dynamic, or populationist, conception systematized before the advent of National Socialism by Fascist ideologues. Mussolini told Galeazzo Ciano that he himself had drafted most of the *Manifesto*.<sup>13</sup> If he did, he compromised the doctrinal integrity of Fascism, for the *Manifesto* introduced indigestible elements of biological determinism that Fascist voluntarism found impossible to assimilate. In fact, several years later, Mussolini specifically denied authorship and told Spampanato that

... the *Manifesto on Race* could have been avoided. It is a scientific abstruseness of certain scholars and journalists, a German text translated into bad Italian. It is a long way from anything I have said, written or signed in fact. ... I have always considered the Italian people an admirable product of diverse ethnic fusions on the basis of a geographic, economic, and especially spiritual unity. It has been the spirit that has put our culture on the byways of the world.<sup>76</sup>

All of this is quite true, but it does not explain the appearance of the *Manifesto*.

What is obvious is that the *Manifesto* contains two incompatible conceptions of race. On the one hand it speaks of the Italians as a “race” that has become “pure” through a historical process of systematic inbreeding with relatively little admixture of foreign “blood.” Whatever this may mean, it obviously refers to a population, a breeding circle. It is a dynamic concept. Yet elsewhere in the document races are identified by strictly anthropometric traits and the classification is taxonomic, static. The races mentioned are those familiar to physical anthropologists: Nordics, Mediterraneans, Alpines, and so forth. To increase the confusion, the *Manifesto* begins with the disclaimer that “to say that human races exist is not to say a priori that there exist superior or inferior races, but only to say that there exist different human races.” Then it goes on to proscribe certain interracial marriages, a proscription that could only be warranted by the fact that some races are inferior or by some evidence that the breeding of two equal but different races produces deleterious consequences. Further in the text, “Aryan,” which could have only a cultural or linguistic meaning, is introduced. Besides making the

document confusing, such concepts are incompatible with Fascist doctrine, which employs "nation" as its central analytic tool.

Space forbids any attempt at extended analysis. Here it is only necessary to indicate that the two incompatible concepts of race found in the *Manifesto* precipitated a polarization among Fascists during the final years of the regime. A group of so-called "intransigents" collected around Giovanni Preziosi, perhaps the only systematically anti-Semitic Fascist Italy produced, who attempted to reinterpret Fascist doctrine in terms of a biological and static racism, identifying specific aggregates of men as inferior on the basis of some metric or nonmetric anthropological criteria. The majority of Fascist theoreticians took a position with Carlo Costamagna, who, in his definitive *Dottrina del fascismo*, maintained that "criteria for evaluating one race superior to another . . . defied 'scientific' demonstration. . . ." <sup>77</sup> In September, 1940, Mussolini himself maintained that "there is no such thing as superior and inferior races." <sup>78</sup>

Gentile, of course, remained assiduously aloof from any form of biological racism that was inimical to his ideal of Fascism. He befriended Jewish scholars who had been driven from Germany, assisted some in escaping from Italy when anti-Semitic persecutions began, and, in 1941, when the anti-Semitic campaign was well under way, courted personal risk in paying public homage to his Jewish teacher, Alessandro D'Annunzio. <sup>79</sup>

By the time of the Fascist instauration in the north in 1943 the two factions had polarized. Fascism had split along lines that followed the race question. The Fascist intransigents openly renounced Gentile and advocated the reconstruction of doctrine on the basis of National Socialist biologism. Preziosi, an intimate of Alfred Rosenberg and a vocal critic of Mussolini, was considered a substitute for Mussolini by the National Socialists. Preziosi's opposition to Gentile was so violent that in 1943 Gentile at first refused to participate in the Fascist republican government. Only a personal appeal by Mussolini persuaded him to assume the presidency of the Fascist Italian Academy.

From 1943 until the destruction of the Fascist republic Mussolini's authority papered over the dissension. It was only with the assassination of Gentile in April, 1944, that Mussolini finally submitted to National Socialist pressure and appointed Preziosi, whom he found "repulsive," Inspector General for Race. At the same meeting in which he announced the death of Gentile Mussolini announced the appointment of Preziosi. This marked the last and most tragic phase of anti-Semitism and biological racism in Fascist Italy and opened a breach in Fascist doctrine that threatened the integrity of the entire system. It remains an embarrassing and unassimilable adjunct to Fascist ideology. The most systematic neo-Fascist authors today identify it as alien to Fascism, an aberrancy that undermines the coherency of the system,<sup>80</sup> just as the concept of consciousness introduced from without undermined classical Marxism.

The remaining doctrinal developments pursued their course during the brief life span of the Fascist Social Republic. Perhaps the most significant development is that resulting from the searching criticism that the Fascists leveled against themselves. The *Manifesto of Verona* of November, 1943, which served as the constitution of the republic, contains the judgment that Fascist Italy's electoral experience had been negative and that the head of the republican government would be elected every five years by the entire citizenry. This reassessment is of critical importance. What the Fascists of Verona indicated was that an elite must be in a position to license its rule. Leninism attempts to produce such a license by claiming that the elite possesses a theory composed of universal and necessary truths. Fascists have made no such claim. But if an elite is to rule, some legitimizing procedure seems to be required. That the Fascist republicans of Verona made recourse to periodic elections seems to indicate that they understood rule to be legitimized by the consent of the ruled. This interpretation seems fully borne out by Gentile's doctrine of toleration spelled out in his final Fascist apologetic, *The Genesis and Structure of Society*. Gentile argued that humanity cannot be divided, on the basis of simple exclusive alternatives, into the elected and the damned. Consensus can legitimately be obtained only by an on-going dialogue in which all men, at least initially, are accepted as equal. The right of some to speak for all must be licensed by the consent of the

ruled, who are convinced that the rulers are qualified for their position.<sup>81</sup> The importance of such a principle is obvious. The analysis of the conditions that would make implementation of the principle effective is the task of political scientists. But that the Fascists of Verona were aware that at least some of the conditions had to be established is indicated by the fact that the Verona *Manifesto* included specific provisions for the liberty of person ("No citizen arrested *in flagrante*, or detained for preventive measures, can be detained over seven days without an order from the judicial authority"), protection from domiciliary search ("Except in cases *in flagrante*, an order from the judiciary is necessary for domiciliary search"), and entrenched freedom for the magistrature ("In the exercise of its functions the magistracy will act in full independence").

On the other hand, the Fascist Republican party remained the sole and indivisible repository of the responsibility for the "people's education." The Jews were still spoken of as a race and were declared foreigners. The latter was qualified by the amendment that such was to be the case for the duration of the war. The Verona *Manifesto* contained no other reference to race, and, in fact, as early as June, 1942, Mussolini had made it clear that he could not conceive of biological racism surviving the war.<sup>82</sup>

Finally, the social and economic doctrinal statements contained in the Verona *Manifesto* indicated that it was largely the work of Mussolini himself<sup>83</sup> and marked a return to the syndicalist and socialist origins of early Fascism. His speech of December, 19-14, indicated that Mussolini himself thought of it as a return. During the last year of his life he spoke of the Fascism of the Verona *Manifesto* as a Fascism relieved of much of the "tinsel" that impeded its march, freed of the many "compromises required by contingencies"—a Fascism "returned to its revolutionary origins. . . ." He spoke of the implacable internal opposition of "industrial and financial groups," which had deformed Fascism, and of Italy as a "proletarian nation" opposed by capitalist nations.<sup>84</sup>

Socialization became one of the social and economic preoccupations of the republic with the direction of industry the joint responsibility of workers and managerial committees in a literal reinvocation of the early Fascist demands for industrial

"committees of competence."<sup>85</sup> Mussolini did not hesitate to refer to these developments as "true socialism," a nonmaterialist or *Fascist* socialism, resting on the interests of the people and the nation. The nation thus remained the irreducible theoretical and analytic tool of Fascist ideology. Fascist socialism was supplemented by a conviction that labor in all its manual and intellectual forms was essential to the full development of man, a conception Fascists identified as a "humanism of labor." And labor could only be conducted in a social context, a national context. Man could fulfill himself only in society and his fulfillment was the embodiment of human liberty, for liberty was understood as the free choice of rule-governed behavior calculated to achieve man's maturation as man. The rule-governed relations found in the family, in class association, in participation in categories of productive labor were all synthesized in the nation-state.<sup>80</sup> It was a conception essentially Platonic and Hegelian. Plato's *Republic*, in fact, was a volume to which Mussolini returned again and again during this last period, and it was during this period that he identified the Fascist conception of the ethical state with that of Hegel.<sup>87</sup>

The Fascism of the final period received its fullest philosophical explication in Gentile's posthumously published *The Genesis and Structure of Society*, written immediately prior to the founding of the Fascist republic. There seems little doubt that Gentile's last thoughts reflected Fascism's final ideological reflections. This volume has provided the only coherent expression of contemporary neo-fascism, and it is to this final period of Fascism, to the ideological system constructed in its final days, that contemporary neo-Fascists have turned for the truth of Fascism.

### *Fascisms*

- The fascisms that arose as indigenous developments in a variety of countries—the corporativism of Vichy France, the National Union of Portugal, the Falangism of Spain, the Justicialismo of Peron's Argentina—remained essentially *immature* ideological systems. Most of them developed a doctrinal coherence that displayed overt fascist features: a pronounced ethical idealism, the theoretical and sentimental emphasis on the

nation, the advocacy of minoritarian rule in a strong, integralist state, the collaboration of classes within the nation, and a one-party political

system. Some emphasized specific doctrinal components at the expense of others, but all were related in a family of regimes sharing some features of the paradigmatic model. Petain's France displayed an emphatic corporative structure that reflected Italian Fascist institutions; nonetheless, it was rooted in a long French intellectual tradition, which included the mixed heritage of Sorelian thought. It incorporated the corporativist thought of Emile Durkheim, who performed the services for the Vichy theoreticians that Vilfredo Pareto had performed for Mussolini. Durkheim had emphasized the sentiment of sodality, the solidarity created by "collective consciousness." He spoke of such a consciousness as transcending that of the individual who participated in it. Any society that failed to utilize, protect, and foster such a sentiment threatened the individual with *anomie* (a pervasive sense of detachment), which reduced him to impotence and society to a mere aggregate of individuals stripped of the belief system that animated it. A viable society required such belief systems, and individuals required society to develop into persons.

Although elements of fascism characterized Vichy France, it was essentially a regime created to meet contingencies. Its brief span of life did not permit the maturation of a coherent doctrinal position, and its elitism seemed to have been little more than expediency. The role of the state was never clearly defined, and all the parliamentary machinery of the liberal past was retained.

Salazar's regime in Portugal displays many of the same features. Its corporativist features obviously reflect fascist influence, and Salazar's long tenure in office gives the regime a spurious elitist appearance. At best, Portugal can be identified as a "clerical-fascist" regime, so strong is the influence of the Catholic Church. Its "integralist" conception of society stops short at identifying man as essentially a political or social animal who finds fulfillment only within the ordered relations of a rule-governed community. As early as 1930 Salazar maintained that the individual is possessed of certain inalienable rights that the state or society cannot abridge. Mihail Manoilescu, one of the most articulate of the prewar fascist commentators, characterized